School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1347610

ALLEN: THE CHRIST OF THE FUTURE

BT
993
B45
A5

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

THE CHRIST OF THE FUTURE

A. J. C. ALLEN, M.A.

WITH FOREWORD BY THE
RT. REV. J. E. WATTS-DITCHFIELD, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

THE CHRIST OF THE FUTURE

BT
993
B45
A5

THE CHRIST OF THE FUTURE

A CRITICISM AND A FORECAST

BY

A. J. C. ALLEN, M.A.

VICAR OF GREAT AND RECTOR OF LITTLE CHESTERFORD, ESSEX
FORMERLY VICAR OF S. MARY'S-THE-LESS, CAMBRIDGE, AND
SOMETIME FELLOW AND ASSISTANT TUTOR OF PETERHOUSE

AUTHOR OF
"THE CHURCH CATECHISM: ITS HISTORY AND CONTENTS"
ETC., ETC.

WITH A FOREWORD BY THE
RT. REV. J. E. WATTS-DITCHFIELD, D.D.
LORD BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT
ROXBURGHE HOUSE
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
MCMXX

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
Calif.
California

FOREWORD

THIS book, written by one whose long connexion with Cambridge has given him an insight into the practical and logical results of the "liberal" theology, is timely. The attempt to reconstruct the Faith by men who, while reciting the Creed in the midst of their congregations, eliminate its central facts, often ends by undermining the faith of believers. Mr. Allen has pierced the joints in the armour of the "liberal" interpretation of the Creeds, because he sees clearly the point at issue, and this in spite of the vagueness with which the exponents of the modern school obscure their writings by that hesitating timidity which refuses to push their theories to their logical conclusions. The whole fabric of the Christian religion rests upon the fact that Jesus *was* God. This is the assumption that underlies every clause in the Church's creeds. Because of this, the Church knew that its vital truth was at stake in its struggle with Arianism. Now the "liberal" school seems to say that Jesus is *like* God and reveals God, but the latent idea which lurks in the "liberal" mind is

that His life can be accounted for by the same motives and principles as govern our human lives. Hence they are willing to admit the bulk of the miracles which may be accounted for by a great personality and the influence of a master mind. This accounts naturally, in their view, for the big group of "supra-naturam" miracles. But the other group of "contra-naturam" miracles, which includes the Virgin Birth, does not fit in with this interpretation. So the "liberal" mind says they are non-essential. It may account for them as accretions for which the atmosphere of a credulous age was responsible. In any case they are matters of *opinion* which may apparently be discarded by those who still hold the "spiritual ideas" which they convey.

To get back to the main issue—either Jesus was the pre-existent God of the opening verses of the Fourth Gospel, or He was the greatest and most spiritual of human leaders. There is no question about the Christ whom the Church has always worshipped and whose triumphs have been in the lives of His followers throughout the centuries. But, as Mr. Allen says truly, a "liberal" Christ, however beautiful and attractive he may appear in the beauty of his Human character, is still man and not God, and cannot be the object of our worship or the Redeemer of our souls. The important question which is scarcely ever faced by the

"liberal" controversialist is not whether his so-called conclusions gratify or even satisfy a few "intellectuals," but whether they lead to the salvation of souls as the Apostle understood salvation. We are told we must treat the scholar tenderly, and I recognize the value of reverent research, but the tendency is to be so tender to the scholar as to become unmindful of the Master, and of the needs of the world. It must be remembered that for every scholar the priest has to deal with a thousand of the unlearned. The proclamation of non-miraculous Christianity or anything approaching it never produces what might be called the greatest of all miracles, the New Birth. It does not save souls. It does not effect that for which Christ died and for which the Church exists. Can the preaching of the Gospel according to the Modernist produce the results achieved by a Wesley, a Moody, a General Booth, or a Gipsy Smith ? By their *fruits* ye shall know them. It was because the world needed salvation that Christ died, and it is for the same reason that we are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation.

It is because Mr. Allen maintains this apostolic doctrine that I warmly commend his valuable work to clergy and laity alike.

J. E. CHELMSFORD.

PREFACE

THE immediate cause for the publication of this pamphlet was the issue of Professor Bethune-Baker's book on the Apostles' Creed, but the principles expressed in it have been thought out in the course of several years' ministry, and I trust they will be helpful to some who find the path of faith difficult in these days of universal questioning.

As I write the Christmas light is shining on us once more with its message of God become man for our salvation. May it shine with ever-increasing clearness to the perfect day!

A. J. C. A.

GREAT CHESTERFORD,
Christmas, 1919.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	FOREWORD	7
	PREFACE	11
I.	INTRODUCTORY	15
II.	THE QUESTION AT ISSUE	20
III.	THE IDEA OF THE INCARNATION	27
IV.	THE RESURRECTION	44
V.	NATURAL OR SUPERNATURAL?	53
VI.	THE REALITY OF MIRACLE	59
VII.	CONCLUSION	66

THE CHRIST OF THE FUTURE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

WHAT is to be the issue of the present condition of things in England, and in the world? Old ideas have been rudely shaken, and the dream of our fathers that Christian morality would, by the force of its own beauty, establish its sway over the minds and hearts of men so soon as it was freed from the burden of Christian dogma has vanished into thin air. Old things are passing away, behold all things are becoming new. The new may be better or worse than the old; it may be the passing away of spiritual ideals; the loosening that will follow of all moral ties; the unbridled devotion of the human race, and each section of the race, to the securing of the good things of this life—to the perpetual internecine strife of all nations and classes which such a condition of things is bound to produce—to the final end, the destruction of the race; or it may be the establishment of the Kingdom of Christ; the stirring of men to devotion

to the crucified, with the destruction that must follow from such devotion, of individual, class, or national selfishness, and the gradual establishment of mutual help, peace, and goodwill on earth. Which it will be it is not for us to prophesy ; but it is incumbent on every one who calls himself a Christian not to despair, however threatening things may seem, but, as he has opportunity, to do what in him lies to promote the cause of right, and the establishment of the Kingdom.

The opposing forces are tremendous. The powers of evil have been unchained by the war and seem to be rampant ; conventional Christianity has largely passed away, and men openly proclaim their rejection of Christ's claim ; while within the Church there is a considerable body of men who claim to remain loyal Christians while they deny or doubt the Virgin-Birth of the Lord, or His Resurrection from the dead on the third day ; and on the other hand, largely as a protest against the last, we see the cult of the Blessed Virgin, and services such as Benediction, openly advocated and practised amongst us, as if these things were the mark of a true " Catholic " and anyone who rejects them were a heretic or unbeliever. On the other hand, there is much to give encouragement. Whether they accept it or not ; whether they regard it as a blessing to the human race, or an evil plant that must be rooted up thinking men have come to

recognise that religion is a great fact, that it has played an enormous part in the past development of the human race, and that it plays an important part still ; that Christianity is a real power that has to be reckoned with ; that Christianity from the first has been essentially sacramental—that is, essentially social—not a matter that merely concerns "my own soul and God," but one that concerns "my own soul, my neighbour's soul, and God." That is a great deal, but there is more. This is a great age of missions. There never was a time when the Church was working more vigorously and making more impression in the heathen world than to-day. When the war broke out it seemed as if Christian missions must suffer, and suffer seriously, that contributions to missions must be largely reduced, that the sight of professedly Christian nations engaged in a death struggle would cause the heathen to turn from Christianity in disgust. That was what we expected and feared. The result has been startlingly different. Mission funds have increased instead of decreasing ; the number of converts is great ; as never before the heathen in India and elsewhere are clamouring for Christian teachers ; the door is open for a great advance.

That is a great hope, but the mission field may help us further. The Christ Who has triumphed in the past, Who has done great things for the blessing

of man, has always been the Christ of the Creed—the Christ Who was born of a Virgin, Who rose from the dead the third day, Who worked miracles when He lived on earth—and it is this Christ, and He alone, Who still wins victories over human souls. That is a fact which will be witnessed to by every successful missionary, and for that matter, by every successful parish priest at home. Can we afford to give it up? Are we, at the bidding of so-called "modern churchmen," and others associated with them, to turn from the Christ of history, the Christ Who works wonders in the mission field to-day, to another master—one who began his human life just as other men do; whose body, after his death, rotted in the grave as other men's bodies do; who while he lived on earth did no miracle; who from the first was totally misrepresented by his followers, who put into his mouth vast claims of power over the world of men and of nature—claims which he never made, to power which he did not possess? That is the real question, but possibly the way it is expressed will give rise to criticism. It is not a question of authority—though there seems at the present time to be a great tendency amongst professors and others to regard themselves as a select body whose opinion is to be accepted as final, and swallowed by the common herd without question—but of evidence. Are the arguments so convincing that if we are to be honest and follow

where reason leads, we must give up our Master and try to find what comfort we can in following the new one who is put before us? It may be rash for one of the common herd, a mere parish priest, to venture to cross swords with learned professors, but some words of the Gospel[1] give encouragement in the effort, and it may be that an honest effort, however humble, will be blest by the Spirit to the guidance and encouragement of some souls. If so I shall be satisfied, and the effort will not have been in vain.

[1] S. Matt. xi. 25; S. Luke x. 21.

CHAPTER II

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE

WE are not concerned in this essay with the movement known as "Modernism"—a movement which arose some time ago in the Roman Church, and is connected specially with the names of Fogazzaro in Italy, Loisy in France, and Tyrrell in England, and which was condemned with great vigour, if with no great wisdom or understanding, by Pius X in the Encyclical Pascendi and the decree Lamentabili. It is true that this movement secured a certain number of followers outside the Roman Church, and the "Modern Churchmen" of to-day are no doubt related to it, but still, the immediate issue is simpler, and it is only with this simpler issue that we propose to deal.

The question is really one of the credibility of miracles. The Virgin-Birth, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Resurrection of the Body, are miracles. Does any amount of human evidence suffice to establish the truth of such things, or must the evidence be set aside, however good it may seem, and the narratives that tell of such things be somehow or other explained away? The ques-

tion, of course, is an old one. Hume, Huxley, and many others have maintained the incredibility of miracles, and have thrown over the profession of Christianity; but to-day, "Modern Churchmen" claim that while they deny or doubt the truth of these miracles, they can still remain loyal Christians; that though the Virgin-Birth and the Resurrection on the Third Day are distinctly affirmed in the Apostles' and (so-called) Nicene Creeds, they can honestly repeat these formulæ because they accept certain religious ideas which they assert are the essential matter, and can be held quite independently of the facts asserted in the Creeds.

It is not necessary here to take up space with any detailed narrative of the steps which have led up to the present position, but a word or two may help to make it plain. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 affirmed its judgment as follows :—

"The Conference, in view of tendencies widely shown in writings of the present day, hereby places on record its conviction that the historical facts stated in the Creeds are an essential part of the Faith of the Church."

This was in accordance with a resolution of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury passed on May 10, 1905, as follows :—

"That this House is resolved to maintain unimpaired the Catholic Faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation as contained in the Apostles' and Nicene

Creeds, and in the Quicunque Vult, and regards the Faith there presented, both in statements of doctrine and in statements of fact, as the necessary basis on which the teaching of the Church reposes."

This resolution was reaffirmed by the Upper House on April 30, 1914. This action was inspired by widespread apprehension among the faithful on this question. The apprehension had been greatly increased by the issue of a pamphlet by Professor Sanday in which he had drawn a distinction between those wonderful works of Christ, such as His miracles of healing, which he described as "supra-naturam," and what he called a "tiny group" which he said were "contra-naturam." He maintained that it was sufficient to accept the former, and that the tiny group might well be given up. At first sight there might appear to be some plausibility in this, but when it was observed that the "tiny group" includes the Virgin-Birth and the Resurrection as well as the Feeding of the Five Thousand, people began to hesitate, and wonder whether the attribute "tiny" was altogether justified. Professor Sanday did not stand alone. The Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge issued a letter to the late Bishop of Oxford, in which he maintained the right of Churchmen to question, and doubt or deny, the facts stated in the Creeds, and he has now followed this up with a book on *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, in which he has

tried to justify his position at length. This book is the work of a mature scholar ; of one who has been chosen to occupy a place in the line adorned with the names of Pearson, Lightfoot, and Hort ; of one who has a considerable gift for writing attractively and easily, and to whose previous works students owe a considerable debt, and therefore calls for respectful and careful consideration.

Professor Bethune-Baker is very emphatic in asserting his belief in the Incarnation. He maintains, and maintains rightly, that the essential matter is the religious value of the statements in the Creed, and not the mere fact that may be stated. We can understand this best by an example. The words of the Creed which speak of the Ascension may be interpreted as simply stating a physical fact. No doubt many Christians have so interpreted them in days gone by, and possibly some do so still. Such people may belong to the class the Professor is so fond of condemning, who have failed to grasp the Copernican view of the Universe, and still regard this earth as the fixed centre round which the rest of the Universe revolves ; or, as appears to me more probable, they belong to the class who, like the Sadducees of old, cannot conceive of any human existence which is not essentially earthly, however exaggerated and perfected that existence may be ; a class which is much larger than is commonly supposed. On the other hand,

thinking Christians at any rate, from the time of S. Paul, have interpreted it as the final stage in the passing of the Lord from the earthly to the heavenly state ; from the life of humility which He lived on earth to the life of glory which He lives now with the Father. That is the religious value of the Ascension, without which any readiness to accept the mere physical fact is valueless. So far, then, we agree entirely with the Professor's contention. A mere physical fact is in itself of no religious value ; it only becomes so when it enshrines and expresses spiritual truth.

But let us note further, that grasping to the fullest the spiritual truth does not involve any mental reservation in repeating the words of the Creed. S. Paul never questioned that the other Apostles had seen the Lord visibly ascend, and if it be said that S. Paul lived before Copernicus, it is obvious to point out that "going up" and cognate expressions were used in S. Paul's day and have been used ever since, with no notion of physical rising or falling. When the humble guest at the wedding feast was bidden to "go up higher" (S. Luke xiv. 10) there was no idea of his climbing a staircase, or if a master tells a boy to go up in a class he does not thereby deny that all the desks are on a level, or if a person in Buxton says he is going up to London he doesn't deny that the journey is, on balance, considerably downhill. The fact is, that plain people find no

difficulty with regard either to the Ascension or the Session at the Right Hand of God. Ask any moderately intelligent child in a Sunday School if by the latter we mean that the Father and the Son are sitting side by side on two chairs and he will answer without hesitation "No!" It is perfectly clear that we are using human language of spiritual things and that the essential matter is the spiritual idea the words are intended to convey. We might go further: we might turn to the passages of the New Testament where the Session is spoken of and show without much difficulty that the writers were setting forth the Glory of the Ascended Lord and not giving instruction as to any mere physical position.

So far seems quite plain; so far we are in agreement with the Professor, and we can go farther. We admit at once that accepting the mere fact of the Virgin-Birth without accepting the Incarnation is valueless. That it is possible to do so is shown plainly enough by the history of Arian and Unitarian thought, but that any such position has ever been accepted as really Christian is clearly denied not only by the New Testament but by the Creeds of Nicea and Chalcedon and by the Quicunque Vult. The Incarnation is the religious value of the words, "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." It is most necessary that those who repeat the words should be taught their spiritual meaning, and it may be admitted that this is a difficult task;

that ordinary people, and for that matter learned ones too, find any real grasp of the Incarnation extremely difficult ; a fact which, in view of Its stupendous magnitude, it is not hard to understand. Such statements seem very obvious, but we do not imagine that any intelligent, clear-thinking man or woman would imagine that because we insist on the acceptance of the Incarnation as the vital thing, we are therefore justified, while we continue to repeat the Creed, in doubting or denying the Virgin-Birth. Notice the essential difference between this and the case of the Ascension. There, as we have seen, taking the Professors view involves no change in the words of the Creed, whereas in the other case it clearly does. If we doubt the Virgin-Birth we must, either openly or by mental reservation, omit the words " the Virgin," and if we deny it we must read, " born of Mary, who was not a virgin," or some equivalent phrase.

People who maintain that they are at liberty to treat the Creed in this way, while they profess to accept it, have a hard task before them to convince ordinary people that they are right or even that they are honest. Will the arguments that are put forward in the book before us succeed in doing so ? Or, if they don't do that, are they so good and urgent that they deserve to ? That is the Question that we will endeavour to answer in the following pages.

CHAPTER III

THE IDEA OF THE INCARNATION

THE Lady Margaret Professor is very loud in his assertion of the truth of the Incarnation ; grasping this, it is a mere trifle whether we accept the Virgin-Birth or not. He does not deny the latter ; his mind is delightfully vague. In a note on page 68 he says, " In that state of suspense I am content to remain ; but the discussion that follows will show that I can find no place for the supposed fact in connection with the doctrine of the Incarnation, and cannot say that I believe it ! " Downright denial might be more intelligible, and might be easier to deal with, but we must take things as they are, and set forth reasons as best we may, for believing that this state of doubt is untenable and cannot last ; that the belief in the Incarnation will soon go when the fact of the Virgin-Birth is denied or doubted.

It is not possible, of course, to show, " a priori," that the Virgin-Birth is the only method by which God could have wrought the Incarnation. What God could do, and in how many ways He could produce the results that He does produce, are

questions altogether beyond the human mind to answer. All we can expect to be able to do is to see something of the harmony of God's doings, and the suitableness of the method adopted to secure the end in view. Devout meditation has satisfied the human heart that the Crucifixion was a fitting way for securing the redemption of man, but does anyone maintain that we can prove that that is the *only* method that God could have adopted to secure that end? In just the same way, devout meditation has always seen in the Virgin-Birth a suitable way of bringing about the Incarnation, although it is impossible to prove that this is the only possible way. Why then does the Professor accept the *method* of the Atonement and doubt that of the Incarnation? I believe that the only answer is, that the one—the Crucifixion—is regarded as "natural," and the other—the Virgin-Birth—as "miraculous"; that putting men to death by crucifixion is a thing that has happened often, and may happen again any day, whereas the Virgin-Birth is absolutely unique; such a thing never happened before Christ came, and never can happen again. But is such an argument tenable at all? Does it not really assume that the Incarnation is false, that Christ was not only *perfect Man* but *nothing more?* If the Incarnation is true, if Christ was not only perfect Man but perfect God—He in Whose Hands was all power in heaven and

in earth—was not the fact that He was put to death by human agency just as unique and unrepeatable as the Virgin-Birth ? Is not the fact that people commonly talk as if there was a great difference really due to their not stopping to think out the assumption underlying their arguments ? or, does it not assume that while it is possible to believe a unique event in the existence of God, it is not possible to believe one in the material universe ?

But again, no one who really accepts the Atonement as a fact has ever doubted that the Crucifixion was the method by which It was brought about, and just in the same way, no one—down to quite modern times[1]—who had heard of the Virgin-Birth and accepted the Incarnation, ever doubted that the former was the method by which the latter was wrought. It will be noticed that there is a slight difference between these two statements. Every one from the first knew of the Crucifixion. The Crucifixion and the Resurrection were the staple of the Apostolic teaching from the beginning. It could not be so with the Virgin-Birth. There are obvious reasons why the reports of this event should not get into circulation at the first. S. Peter, and the other Apostles, when they began their work at Jerusalem, probably had not heard

[1] We hope to show further on how little this reservation really implies.

of It ; and the same may have been true of S. Paul, in the early days, at any rate, of his ministry ; but does anyone imagine that when he, or any other of the Apostles, heard the story, they doubted its truth, and did not see in it the wonderful divine way in which the wonder of the Incarnation was accomplished ? The answer seems obvious, and yet the Lady Margaret Professor would answer "Yes." He tries hard to make out that it was held in olden days that the acceptance of the Virgin-Birth was a matter of "opinion," while that of the Incarnation was of "faith." He does not indeed maintain that S. John[1] "deliberately intended tacitly to discredit the belief (i.e. in the Virgin-Birth) which was probably already current,"[2] but he distinctly implies that he did not accept it. S. John knew quite well the Gospel of S. Luke, if not that of S. Matthew. He knew the story of the Virgin-Birth. That is admitted on all hands. He knew many things in the Synoptic records—as, for example, the Institution of the Holy Eucharist—which he did not repeat ; he knew some things—as, for example, the date assigned to the Supper at Bethany—as to which they were at fault, and these he silently corrected. We leave it to any fair-minded reader to judge of the probability that he

[1] The argument will not be affected if, for the name, we substitute "the Author of the Fourth Gospel."

[2] *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 76.

rejected the story of the Virgin-Birth and said nothing about it. But further, S. John, after the Crucifixion, took charge of the Blessed Virgin. During these years of intercourse they must have often communed together of the deep things that filled their hearts ; the fact of the Virgin-Birth must have been spoken of, and the doctrine of the Incarnation as given in the Fourth Gospel, on the assumption that S. John was the author, was the outcome of this time of quiet. The Apostle, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, came to see that He Who was born of the Virgin, was the Divine Word, in this manner becoming flesh. Thus everything is consistent and harmonious. In the sixth and seventh chapters of his Gospel the Apostle draws out the spiritual meaning, the religious value of the Eucharist, and in the first chapter the spiritual meaning, the religious value, of the Virgin-Birth.

So much for New Testament authors, but what of after times ? Is there any serious evidence that orthodox Christians have not included the Virgin-Birth amongst their credenda ? Professor Bethune-Baker is much too good a scholar to deny that from the days of Ignatius (*c.* 110) there is absolutely no trace to be found amongst Christian writers of anyone who questioned or denied the fact. But further, it had a place from very early days in the baptismal creeds. " The clause, or one to the same

effect, was already[1] long established, it seems, in the Baptismal Creeds of the West, and it may have been contained in similar Eastern Creeds from an early date."[2] This is undoubtedly true, but on the previous page we are told, "The genuine Creed of Nicea (A.D. 325)—the only one of the Creeds which was compiled by a General Council of the Church—the Creed, moreover, which was intended to be used as a test of orthodoxy in bishops—did not contain this clause, or any like it, rich as it was in phrases, popular and scientific, affirming the full Godhead of the Son. Nor, apparently, had it a place in the old Baptismal Creed of Cæsarea, on which the newer and more technical Creed of Nicea was based. Nor yet again does the most scientific of all our Creeds, the 'Athanasian,' contain any reference to it." What are we to make of this statement? Does the Professor assume that people are so commonly ignorant of the Quicunque Vult that they will not know that it contains the clause, "God of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man of the substance of His Mother, born in the world"? Or, if they do know it, does he think he will persuade anyone, who is not totally blinded by pre-conceived ideas, to believe that it does not assume the Virgin-Birth? that in fact, if the Virgin-Birth is not true, the statement is false, inasmuch as in that case the

[1] i.e. before the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. [2] p. 67.

Lord's human nature came not only from His mother, but from His father too? Then with regard to the Creed of Nicea. It is most true that that document is most "rich in phrases affirming the full Godhead of the Son" while it omits any mention of the Virgin-Birth; but why was it so? Not assuredly because the Virgin-Birth was an open question amongst the Fathers of the Council, but because there was no question raised concerning it. Arius and Athanasius completely agreed in accepting it, though they did not agree as to "the full Godhead of the Son." The Council, therefore, was careful to adopt a formula which safeguarded the latter although it said nothing about the former, just as it left the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit undefined because no question concerning it had been raised.

But again, What think we of the Christ? The answer of the Quicunque is clear. He is perfect God and perfect Man; He is not two but one, and the unity is a unity of His Personality. The Personality is that of the Son of God, Divine, not human. When the Eternal Son came down to earth, He became "man," not "a man."[1] If this personality is human then we are reduced to the impossible

[1] Of course we are quite conscious of the difficulties connected with the idea of impersonal humanity, but cannot stop to discuss them here. It is enough to refer those who wish to pursue the subject to the recently published *Study in Christology*, by the Rev. H. M. Relton, D.D.

thought of an impersonal Deity,[1] and the Christ is One, not as the Quicunque teaches, "by the taking of the manhood into God," but as it denies, "by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh." But what says the Professor? "Christian theologians of the past learned to distinguish between describing our Lord as 'Man' and speaking of Him as 'a man.' The former, they held, was right, the latter was wrong. But many of the most learned and orthodox to-day have abandoned this distinction as one which is not really true to the evidence of the Gospels. The abandonment of this distinction seems to involve the recognition

[1] Of course the Professor would not admit that this is involved in his argument. This is what he says, "Our faith is centred in Jesus as very 'God in man,' but we desire to give that faith free scope and not to imprison it by presuppositions of our own or any other age. We know that whatever else He was, He was a man. He was fully a man. He had what we mean by a human personality. And our further conviction that He was also 'God in man,' the embodiment of the Divine consciousness in man, is not incompatible with the belief that the Divine consciousness was operative in Him solely through His human consciousness, to the full extent to which a human consciousness can serve as its medium. In His case, as in no other, the Divine 'personality' expressed itself through a human 'personality'; the human personality was the personality of God under human conditions" (p. 94). It is tempting to leave this passage to the philosophers if they think it worth serious consideration. It is surely amazing. Christ had a "human personality," but that "human personality" was the "personality of God," and therefore was not a human personality although the Eternal Son might live His Incarnate Life under human conditions, which is of course exactly the orthodox belief though it seems difficult to reconcile it with the first part of the passage.

of what we must call the human personality of our Lord."[1] Again, "The God in Whom 'Christians' believe is the God on communion with Whom the whole Life and Being of Jesus depended. It is, in a word, His God: the God of a Man Who played the part which we know He played in the actual history of the world as we know it. And more than this, He is a God Who is like Jesus Himself, a God of Whose character the character of Jesus is the revelation."[2] God is *like* Jesus; Jesus is *like* God; man is made in the image of God and is therefore *like* Him, but the likeness is not complete till he enters

[1] p. 93.

[2] p. 41. In connection with this passage it is interesting to quote the late Professor Gwatkin's account of the Arian evasions at the Council of Nicea. Speaking of the necessity to which the Council found itself driven of introducing into the Creed phrases not used in Scripture, he says: "As the dispute was not of the Canon but of the interpretation of Scripture, it was quite indifferent how much Scripture was put in the Creed. If Scripture was to be limited to any particular meaning, they must go outside Scripture for technical terms to define that meaning. Athanasius, of course, understood this, but others were less acute, and needed to be convinced of it by a fruitless search for some alternative. We have a curious account (*Ath. ad Afros.* 5 Robertson's *Athan.*, p. 491) of the Arian evasions of every Scriptural expression proposed. If it were Of God, the answer was, 'All things are of God.' If the Lord were described as the Image of God, 'So are we, for In the image of God made He man.' If as the Son, 'We, too, are sons of God.' If as the power of God, 'There are many such powers, the locust and the caterpillar for example' (cf. Joel ii. 25). If as True God of True God, even this was evaded, for the Arians recognised Him as True God *in their sense* from His creation. Thus the conservatives were ultimately driven back on ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας (of the Substance) and ὁμοούσιον (of the same Substance) only by experience of the impossibility of excluding the non-scriptural expressions

into the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision, and then it is "likeness," not "identity." On the other

of Arianism in any other way" (*Studies in Arianism*, 2nd ed., p. 49). How much difficulty would Arius and his followers have found in accepting the Professor's version of the "Faith of the Apostles' Creed"? In this connection it is impossible to avoid quoting another passage from the same great work. On page 43 Gwatkin says, "They (i.e. Athanasius and Marcellus) had not come to the Council to haggle over compromises, but to cast out the blasphemer, and they were resolved to do it effectually."

"Hardly a more momentous resolution can be found in history. The whole future of Christianity was determined by it; and we must fairly face the question whether Athanasius was right or not. Would it not have been every way better to rest satisfied with the great moral victory already gained? When heathen were pressing into the Church in crowds, was that a suitable time to offend them with a solemn proclamation of the very doctrine which chiefly kept them back? It was, moreover, a dangerous policy to insist on measures for which even Christian opinion was not ripe, and it led directly to the gravest troubles in the churches—troubles of which no one then living was to see the end. The first half-century of prelude was a war of giants; but the main contest opened at Nicea is not ended yet, or like to end before the Lord Himself shall come to end it. It was the decision of Athanasius that made half the bitterness between the Roman and the Teuton, between Christianity and Islam to this day. Even now it is the worst stumbling-block of Western unbelief. Many of our most earnest enemies would gladly forget their enmity if we would only drop our mysticism and admire with them a human Christ who never rose with power from the dead. But we may not do this thing. Christianity cannot make its peace with this world by dropping that message from the other which is its only reason for existence. Athanasius was clearly right. When Constantine had fairly put the question, they could not refuse to answer. Let the danger be what it might, they could not deliberately leave it open for Christian bishops (the Creed was not for others) to dispute whether our Lord is truly God or not. Those may smile to whom revelation is a vain thing; but it is our life, and we believe it is their life too" (pp. 43–4).

How much we need another Athanasius to-day!

hand the Christ of the Christian is not only *like* God, but *is* God—perfect God, "equal to the Father as touching His Godhead." That is the difference, the difference between Arius and Athanasius, and it is a difference which no amount of specious language can ever get over, but it is a difference of which the Professor displays very little consciousness.

But further, when we are told that God is like Jesus, that Jesus reveals God to us by His life and character, what are we to understand by Jesus? Is He the Jesus of the "liberal theologian" of the middle of the last century, who found his best description in Ecce Homo, the Jesus Who was so drastically dealt with by Professor Burkitt some years ago?[1] Or is He the crazy fanatic depicted by Schweitzer[2] and others of the recent Eschatological School? Or is He the Jesus of the Gospels—the Jesus Who claimed and exercised the power to raise the dead—Who fed the multitudes with a few small loaves and fishes, and instructed the disciples to gather up the fragments that remained—fragments which much exceeded the whole of the original supply?[3] It is clearly essential that this

[1] *The Failure of Liberal Christianity*, by F. C. Burkitt. Cambridge, 1911.

[2] *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, by Albert Schweitzer. English translation.

[3] Dr. Sanday, *Bp. Gore's Challenge to Criticism*, p. 25, finds special difficulty with this Miracle because it is one of the best attested events in the Gospel history. It is

question should be answered; the Professor does not answer it, but as we read his book, particularly the later part of it, it becomes clear that his Christ is that of the "liberal school" though more purely and merely human than the Christ of "Ecce Homo,"

embedded, as well as the Feeding of the Four Thousand, in the earliest stratum of Gospel tradition as represented by S. Mark. It is of course quite possible to distinguish strata of varying date in the narratives as we have them, and to maintain that what we find in the later strata is not so well attested as that in the earliest, but when we have reduced the narrative to this earliest form we can only cut pieces out of it by help of our own subjective judgment of what ought and ought not to be there. Now to exercise this judgment is clearly most "unscientific" and Dr. Sanday is nothing if not "scientific." He therefore cannot get rid of the Miracle simply by sweeping it aside. He has to adopt another method. How does he do it? "The story," he says, "is thus full of genuine historical matter. I believe, with Schweitzer, that the substance of it is all historical, except the one phrase 'and they were all filled' (with the details that go with it). This preternatural filling is the only addition. Where does it come from? I have little doubt that it comes from the stories of multiplied food found in the Old Testament narratives of Elijah and Elisha, and especially from the story of the man of Baal-shalisha in 2 Kings iv. 42–4." It would be interesting if space permitted to quote the whole passage and try to unravel the extraordinary confusion of thought and inability to get behind mere words to the truths they represent which it displays, but it is enough to consider what the narrative in S. Mark becomes when the "one phrase" is cut out of it? A vast multitude had followed our Lord out into the desert. They had been hanging on His wonderful words and had had little or nothing to eat all day. He was going to send them away, and they had a considerable distance to go before they could procure rest and refreshment. Under the circumstances they are told to arrange themselves as for a meal. They are given a crumb of bread and a microscopic portion of fish each and they rise up and go away refreshed and strengthened for their journey! Verily when we read such things we cannot but feel that there are still men amongst us who strain at gnats and swallow camels.

with one or two touches added from the eschatologists. It is little wonder then that he finds no need for the fact of the Virgin-Birth.

Christians have always believed that the Incarnation marks a new beginning in the history of man and the relation of man to God. If the Eternal Son really came down from Heaven; emptied Himself of the Glory which He had with the Father before the worlds; lived a human life; died and rose again, and thereby opened the gate of Heaven to all believers, it could not be otherwise—and it has seemed reasonable that this stupendous event, the birth of this absolutely unique Person, should be brought about in a way different from that by which ordinary men and women begin their lives.[1]

[1] Christian thinkers have naturally speculated as to *why* the Virgin-Birth was adopted as the method of bringing about the Incarnation. Two of the reasons that have been suggested are mentioned in the book before us. First the suggestion thrown out by Ignatius, and repeated by others, that it was a device adopted by the Almighty to deceive the Devil; and secondly that it was necessary in order to produce an impersonal humanity and to cut off the entail of sin. Professor Bethune-Baker spends a good deal of time on the second of these. In the arguments used to support it, it has commonly been assumed that a child's personality comes entirely from the father and not at all from the mother, and this idea, as the Professor tells us, is not confirmed by modern biology; but surely it is possible to hold that it requires the *combination* of both parents to produce the ordinary human child, and when the *combination* does not take place the result is "impersonal humanity." Assuredly no results of modern science can refute this, because as the Virgin-Birth is absolutely unique there are no other cases to observe and from which conclusions can be drawn. So with the entail of sin. It is quite possible to hold that it is handed on by the

The Professor admits that there is some force in this argument, but he goes on, " I distrust the argument I have stated with its phrases ' break in the succession ' and ' discontinuous ' and the idea of a process of birth that was new and unique. The analogy of knowledge and theory in other departments of human observation and experience does not confirm the idea that in order to have a ' new beginning ' there must be a break in the succession, a discontinuity as regards the natural processes at work. ' Epigenesis ' and ' creative evolution ' are terms which sum up the conclusions of the observers, and thinkers who are best qualified to act as our guides in this matter ; and they are terms that suggest that new creative factors may enter into the world without a break in the continuity of the processes of ' Nature.' " [1]

combination of the two parents and not by either singly, and so to believe that it was cut off by the Virgin-Birth without being driven back, as the Professor tries to drive us, on the idea of the immaculate conception.

[1] pp. 91–2. The statement in the text will, I hope, show that the argument does not necessarily involve the use of the phrases which the Professor criticises. Perhaps when he sees it stated without them he will find it more convincing. Whether ordinary people will be convinced by the reference to "epigenesis" and "creative evolution" with no further explanation may be doubted. As a matter of fact it does not seem easy to say what may be meant by them. Dr. Mitchell, in the article " Evolution " in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, speaking of Harvey's work, *Exertationes de Generatione Animalium*, published in 1651, tells us, " One of Harvey's prime objects is to defend and establish, on the basis of direct observation, the opinion already held by Aristotle that, in the higher animals, at any rate, the

It is really all of a piece. The Incarnation, instead of being an absolutely unique, stupendous event, the centre of the history of man, is on a level with other "new beginnings" which scientific men, with the aid of microscopes and other instruments of research, have succeeded in detecting as occurring from time to time in the course of "Nature."

The conclusion seems clear. Professor Bethune-Baker has started to set forth the religious value of

formation of the new organism by the process of generation takes place, not suddenly . . . but by *epigenesis* or successive differentiations of a relatively homogeneous rudiment into the parts and structures which are characteristic of the adult" (vol. x. p. 29). Aristotle's opinion on this difficult matter may of course be right, but it is really difficult to see what bearing it has on the nature and method of the Incarnation. On the other hand, "creative evolution" is quite a modern development. It is the central principle of Mons. Bergson's philosophy. If we adopt it, our idea of God, unless we abandon belief in Him altogether, must be radically changed, because we can no longer think of Him, of ultimate reality, as either *matter* or *spirit* but as *change*. How far we will be driven is shown clearly in the following passage from Mr. Wildon Carr's *Philosophy of Change* (p. 195). "The philosophy of change does not then sound any clear and confident note as to what lies beyond us in the unseen world. It does not present to us God as the loving Father of the human race, whom He has begotten or created that intelligent beings may recognise Him and find happiness in Communion with Him. There may be truth in this ideal, but it is no part of philosophy. Neither does it teach us the brotherhood of the human race—on the contrary it seems to insist that strife and conflict are the essential conditions of activity. Life is a struggle, and the opposing elements are the nature of life itself, the very principle of it." Does Professor Bethune-Baker really accept this philosophy, and if so, how does he reconcile Christianity—even liberal Christianity—with it? And if not, why does he hold the central principle of it as the best guide in matters affecting the method of the Virgin-Birth?

the clauses of the Apostles' Creed. The "religious value" of the clause we are considering is the "Incarnation." The argument is that it is possible to hold the full truth of the Incarnation while denying or doubting the fact of the Virgin-Birth, and presumably the Professor claims that he himself holds that truth. We hope that what we have said above is sufficient to convince any unprejudiced reader that far from accepting it he has very little inkling of what it means to a Christian heart, that he, and e.g. the late Professor Gwatkin, are, in this matter, poles asunder.[1]

Other parts of the book will strengthen this conviction.

On page 60 and the following, the words "our Lord" are dealt with. A page is spent in warning us against giving too much meaning to this title. He admits that the title involves the idea of worship. "The elements of a 'cult' must have been present from the moment of such experiences as the Resurrection and the Ascension, and the experience of Pentecost must have confirmed them," but it is clearly necessary to be cautious because we are

[1] The following words from page 616 of Dr. Bussell's *Religious Thought and Heresy in the Middle Ages* seem worth quoting. Speaking of the teaching of Mani, he says, "It drew proselytes from the discontented and decaying sects, and built its appeal upon the same ultra-refinement that tended rather to Platonism than towards Christian dogma. It abolished the Old Testament and denied a really divine incarnation and so pleased the *intelligenzia*."

told just before that "Students whose business it is to trace the development of early Christian thought and feeling have tried to mark the variations in the use of the title by Christians, and some have detected in them stages by which the influence of non-Christian associations grew, or the 'cult' of its patron by the new religious society was established." However, in spite of all cautions, we are told, "The words 'our Lord' thus do imply the cult. Our thanksgiving and praise are due to Him. And the prayers that we send up to God, even the petitions, are as naturally addressed to Him Whom we know, Who personalises God[1] and makes Him real to us, as to the Father to Whom He taught men to pray in the spirit of His own prayer, as man. Prayer made to Him is made to the God He revealed." So we have it again. Christ *reveals* God, not Christ *is* God. We can assure the Professor that from the days of Pliny downwards, the prayers and praises of Christians have been addressed to "Christ as God," and not to any prophet or Apostle, although it may be truly said of them that they, too, reveal God to men.

[1] A statement like this makes one wonder whether the Professor intends his language to be taken seriously. On page 94, referring to Lotze, he says, "Perfect personality," we know, "is in God only"—so He Who alone is perfectly personal is "personalised" by becoming man, who is at the best only imperfectly personal!

CHAPTER IV

THE RESURRECTION

IT is a great relief to turn from the chapters we have been considering to the Professor's treatment of the Resurrection. Through the note on "The Intermediate State" and the chapter on the Resurrection[1] there runs a strain of faith and devotion which is sadly wanting in the treatment of the Incarnation. Unlike Canon Glazebrook and others he accepts the Resurrection on the Third Day and expresses it in words which can hardly be improved upon. "The individual personality was not lost or dissipated or absorbed in something greater than itself; it was all there, freed, as we say, from some of its earthly limitations, but not from those of individuality, still having an organ of expression of itself. It is this conviction that constitutes the faith of a Christian in the Resurrection. That faith does not require belief in any particular conception as to the mode of the Resurrection, but the belief that the very Person Who 'died' on the Cross manifested Himself alive after His death to living men and women; that the

[1] pp. 126–132.

experience which came to the earliest witnesses in the form of Vision and Voice was effected by His actual and active Personality; that He was still living in His perfected Manhood, able to guide and help them. Without this belief there can be no doctrine of the Incarnation, no Gospel, no Church." [1] And again on the next page, speaking of the Ascension, he says, "We may pause for a moment's thanksgiving that, in no longer being obliged to think of a 'bodily' Ascension, we are saved from any need to enter on those hopeless controversies as to the 'locality' of our Lord's Body, which distracted our forefathers and led some of them to evacuate the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper of all its meaning by denying the reality of His 'Presence' at it. Indeed when we think of the Resurrection or of the Ascension as 'bodily' occurrences in any *natural or physical* [2] sense of the word 'bodily,' our thought about the *rationale* of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and Sacraments in general is no longer as much bemused as the thought of Christians has been in the past."

All this is excellent; it sums up the teaching of the Resurrection and the Ascension contained in the New Testament admirably; it expresses the belief held by S. Paul and in after times by Origen and other Christian teachers.

But let us be quite clear that it does not involve,

[1] p. 132. [2] The italics are ours.

as suggested by Professor Bethune-Baker,[1] that S. Paul did not know, or doubted, the story of the empty tomb. It is quite incredible that he had not heard of it. The Resurrection on the *third day* was an article of his belief, and he must have accepted it on the testimony of the other Apostles and the common teaching of the Church, but does anyone believe that the authorities which told him of the Resurrection on the third day did not tell him, too, how the tomb had been found empty, that the Body of the Lord had vanished, because it was risen? Furthermore, when he communed at Jerusalem with "James and Cephas and John"[2] it is incredible that he did not hear the story of the grave clothes and the faith that had come to S. John from what he had seen; and such discourse must have helped, not to strengthen his conviction that the Lord was risen—of that he had no doubt—but to help him to formulate his views of the character of the Resurrection.

S. Paul's mind was filled with the greatness of the change wrought by the Resurrection. The Lord had passed from humility to glory, from an earthly to a heavenly life. Christians were to pass through a similar change. "We shall not all sleep," he wrote to the Corinthians, "but we shall all be changed"; [3] and a few years later to the Philippians, "Who—i.e. Jesus Christ—shall fashion anew the

[1] p. 173. [2] Gal. ii. 9. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 51.

body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the Body of His glory." [1]

This second passage seems clear. There is no destruction of one body and the replacing of it by another, but the new, the spiritual body, is developed out of the old, the material body. The body of the old man of eighty is the same body as that of the babe a few weeks old, not, assuredly because there is much outward resemblance between them, or still less because they are composed of the same particles of matter, but because the one has grown out of the other, because they are both the vehicle by which the one individual is fitted to his surroundings. So with the Resurrection Body, it is not a new creation coming down from heaven, but it grows out of, it is that into which, by the power of God, the Body of the Lord's humiliation is fashioned. And is not that exactly what S. Paul meant by his illustration of the seed-corn[2] which vanishes in the ground but from which there springs a plant, apparently entirely different, but yet the product of the seed? It all seems quite plain and perfectly consistent, and if Christians from the first days had been able to grasp it and hand on the message as S. Paul delivered it, it is probable that no serious disputings on the matter would have arisen; but unfortunately it has not been so. Christian teachers, particularly in the West, have

[1] Phil. iii. 21 (R.V.). [2] 1 Cor. xv. 35 ff.

constantly used very materialistic language regarding the resurrection, language which, as is pointed out above, has led to grievous difficulties. We do not question this fact. Western Creeds have used the phrases, "resurrection of the flesh" or "resurrection of this flesh" almost universally, and as pointed out by Professor Bethune-Baker,[1] in the Middle Ages, Bishops at their consecration were obliged to express their belief in "the resurrection of this flesh which thou now hast on thee." But with regard to this there is something to say.

First, it is noticeable that the Eastern Creeds have never adopted the phrases used in the West, but have always spoken of "the resurrection of the dead," and views of the Resurrection akin to S. Paul's have prevailed in the East much more than in the West, and therefore phrases such as "the resurrection of the flesh," and materialistic notions flowing from them, are not of universal acceptance in the Christian Church, in the same way that the acceptance of the Virgin-Birth is.

But secondly there is no difficulty in explaining how the phrases in question became prevalent. A good deal is due to the unspeculative character of the Western mind. To the philosophic East it has always been much easier to avoid the error of the Sadducees [2] than it has been to the West, and there

[1] p. 173. The question still stands in the Roman Pontifical.
[2] Mark xii. 24.

can be little doubt that it is from the same cause that much of the difficulty felt to-day amongst us has arisen. A good deal, too, is due to the prevalence of Docetism in the early days. The idea that the Lord's Body was a mere phantom, that His humanity was not real, but only an appearance, taught in various forms, and with various degrees of consistency, is perhaps the most widespread and dangerous heresy with which the Church has ever been faced; and it was to refute this that the phrases quoted above were introduced. It was essential to insist on the reality of the Lord's humanity, not only while He lived on earth, but after His Resurrection, and to the unphilosophic mind the passage from "real" to "physical" or "material" is not difficult.

This fact may take us a step farther. It was vital that the Apostles should be convinced, with a conviction that admitted of no doubt, that the Lord was really risen, that He Whom they beheld was no mere phantom, but the Lord Whom they had known, living still in the completeness of His humanity. Now does any one really believe that this conviction could have been produced if the tomb on the first Easter Day had not been found empty, or that it would have survived if there had been any reason to believe that the Body had been removed, and still less, if the Jewish authorities, as they undoubtedly would have done if they could,

had produced it? Peter was convinced, *not merely* because the tomb was empty, *not merely* because he saw the Lord, but because of both facts and because they fitted together.

But again, just as unscriptural phrases were introduced into the Creed of Nicea to guard the full doctrine of the Incarnation against the error of Arius; and as the Fathers of the Council believed, and we hold believed rightly, that they were thereby guarding the true sense of Holy Scripture; so Fathers and others who used materialistic language of the Resurrection believed that thereby they were guarding and preserving the teaching of the Bible. The intention was good and noble, and it is only fair to them to remember it when we feel inclined to use strong language about the way they talk of the Resurrection. There has been no more earnest or more effective defender of the cause of Christ than S. Augustine, and yet he used language on this matter which we would deprecate to-day. He was clearly led to it by his efforts to interpret Holy Scripture, and we cannot doubt that if he had understood it less materialistically and more spiritually he would have adhered to, or even gone beyond, the teaching of his early days.[1]

[1] In his early work, *De Fide et Symbole*, Augustine wrote as follows: "Therefore the body will rise again, according to the Christian faith which cannot deceive. Which, if it seem to any one incredible, he regards what the flesh now is, but considers not what it will be, because in that time of angelic change, it will

The principle stated above is one which will help much in the study of medieval Theology generally, and particularly of its teaching on the Resurrection, and it will throw some light on the question quoted above which used to be addressed to Bishops at their consecration. Professor Bethune-Baker gives no reference to his authority for this question, and so readers of his book who are not sufficiently instructed to know where to find it are obliged to take his statement on trust and have no opportunity of considering it in the light of its context. It may be found in Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia*, ed. 1, vol. 3, p. 251. It will be seen there that the question forms one of a long series addressed to the bishop-designate, but what is noticeable is that the series opens as follows :—

" Therefore by the same authority and command we ask thee, dearest brother, in sincere charity, if you wish to accommodate all your life and teach-

be no longer flesh and blood, but only body. . . . And therefore that which he (i.e. S. Paul) says, ' Flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God ' contradicts not the resurrection of the flesh, but declares what that will one day be which is now flesh and blood. Into which sort of nature whosoever believes not that this flesh can be changed, he must be led step by step unto faith " (section 24). But afterwards, feeling forced thereto by Holy Scripture, he largely withdrew from this position. The various phases of his teaching are set forth at length by Dr. Sparrow Simpson in his work on *The Resurrection and Modern Thought* (Longmans, 1911), pp. 361 ff. I should like once for all to refer those who wish to study the subject further, to this most admirable work, based as it is on wide learning and characterised by soundness of judgment and Christian faith.

ing (*prudentiam*) as far as you can, to the sense of Holy Scripture ?

Resp.: I so wish with all my heart to obey it and consent to it in all things.

Inter.: Do you wish, both by word and example, to teach the people for whom you are to be ordained, those things which you learn from Holy Scripture ?

Resp.: I so wish."[1]

The intention seems clear. Holy Scripture is to be the guide of the Bishop's life and teaching and the other questions addressed to him are intended to safeguard the meaning of Scripture as it was understood at the time. We believe that by the guidance of the Holy Spirit we have gained truer ideas than were expressed in these questions, and they are no longer in use amongst us. The Creeds we repeat do not contain them or any expressions which of necessity involve such materialistic conceptions ; and as we have seen, the Creeds of the East have always been entirely free from them. It is quite time that those who wish to get rid of the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection should abandon the effort to bolster up their case by quoting the materialistic teaching prevalent in the Middle Ages.

[1] Op. cit., p. 246.

CHAPTER V

NATURAL OR SUPERNATURAL ?

THE present controversy has largely arisen out of "An open letter addressed to the Clergy of his Diocese," by Bishop Gore in 1914. This letter was entitled "The Basis of Anglican Fellowship." In this letter Bishop Gore maintained (1) That the results of criticism applied to the New Testament establish instead of destroying the truth of the Virgin-Birth and the Resurrection, and (2) That if a man felt himself driven by criticism to deny or doubt these facts, he was in all honesty bound to cease regarding himself as an orthodox Christian and certainly had no right to retain his place as a teacher in the Church of England. Professor Sanday, in his reply, called this, "Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism." He maintained that we must accept the assured results of Criticism whatever they may be, and that, if only we accept certain spiritual truths, whatever we think about facts, we can remain orthodox Christians. This is, of course, consistent. It is the thoroughgoing "modernist" position, which maintains that the idea is everything, the fact nothing ; that the fact

of the Virgin-Birth is of no moment so long as we accept the Incarnation; that the fact that such a Person as Jesus ever existed at all does not matter so long as we have before us as an object of faith the idea of the God-Man painted in the Gospels. But the Lady Margaret Professor will not have it. Criticism must have limits, and those who are carried beyond these limits cannot continue Christians. "With regard to this question (i.e. the existence of Jesus)," he writes in a note on p. 43, "there are only two remarks to be made that are germane to our subject. The reality of the existence of Jesus is central to the faith of a Christian, just because He is conceived as the Personal incarnation of the Personality of God. If He did not really exist, there has not been made that manifestation of God to men on belief in which the whole Christian doctrine of God depends. And again, it must be remarked, that it is not from those who have entered most fully into the critical study of the Gospels that doubts about the existence of Jesus come. Such students may think that the historical Jesus has been transfigured by later belief into something far less human than he really was, but the more human and natural He becomes in the crucible of critical study, the clearer does the proof of His real existence become." Notice what this involves; it assumes (1) That criticism, instead of destroying, establishes the fact of the existence

of Jesus, and (2) That if anyone is carried on to deny this fact, he cannot honestly remain a Christian ; but these are exactly the positions maintained by Bishop Gore with regard to the Virgin-Birth. The difference between him and the Professor, therefore, is not one of principle, but only of where you must draw the line which cannot be crossed without ceasing to be Christian. The question is : Has the Professor drawn it rightly ?

An enormous amount of labour has been spent during the last century, particularly in Germany, on the criticism of the Gospels, and the effort to construct a really "scientific" life of Christ, i.e. to depict Jesus as He really lived, stripped of all the colouring which the Christian thought of later days may have cast back on Him. The *Leben Jesu* of David Frederick Strauss, first published at Berlin in 1835 and a few years after translated into English, marks a great turning point in this search. As Schweitzer[1] tells us, this was one of the lives of Christ which was animated by hatred. Strauss frankly proclaimed himself a non-Christian and got rid of the miraculous narratives in the Gospels by explaining them all as mythical inventions of later times. To him Jesus was a man and nothing more. The actions of His life were to be accounted for by the same motives and principles as prevail in ordinary human lives. This is, of course, a per-

[1] Op. cit., p. 4.

fectly consistent position. It denies the supernatural: it denies the Incarnation. German critics of the Gospel history since Strauss have adopted it: they have constructed a series of "liberal" lives of Jesus, one after the other, each labouring to get rid of the impossibilities maintained by their predecessors. The results of it are summed up concisely by Schweitzer:

"The historical foundation of Christianity as built up by rationalistic, by liberal, and by modern theology, no longer exists; but that does not mean that Christianity has lost its historical foundation. The work which historical theology thought itself bound to carry out, and which fell to pieces just as it was nearing completion, was only the brick facing of the real immovable historical foundation which is independent of any historical confirmation or justification.

Jesus means something to our world because a mighty spiritual force streams forth from Him and flows through our time also. This fact can neither be shaken nor confirmed by any historical discovery. It is the solid foundation of Christianity.

The mistake was to suppose that Jesus could come to mean more to our time by entering into it as a man like ourselves. That is not possible. First because such a Jesus never existed. Secondly, because, although historical knowledge can no doubt introduce greater clearness into existing

spiritual life, it cannot call spiritual life into existence." [1]

This passage is in no way exaggerated. The recent Eschatological School have destroyed once and for all the dreams of the liberal theologians. They have grasped the fact that the history of Christianity and its power in the world to-day demands that the Founder should be more than a man like ourselves. They have accordingly reinvestigated the Gospel records, and have produced a picture totally different from the " Jesus " of the " liberal " school. What the picture is, it is difficult to describe with any brevity, but it is hardly an exaggeration to say that Schweitzer [2] represents Jesus as a fanatic obsessed with the idea that the world is coming to a speedy end ; that in the new age He is to reign supreme over a Messianic Kingdom ; that repeated disappointments availed nothing to waken Him to the falseness of His dreams ; that finally He went to Jerusalem to force on the catastrophe He was expecting, and in the effort died the death which was the seal of His failure. Then we are asked to believe that this was the Jesus Whom those who had known Him on earth, in a few years came to worship as God made Man ; that He was the Origin and Inspiration of the Christian Church, and the Source of that Power that has transformed and still transforms

[1] Op. cit., p. 397. [2] Op. cit., chap. xix.

the world! Could absurdity go further? Is it not obvious that the hypothesis which first drives men on with desperate labour to construct the picture of the "liberal" Jesus Whom further research proves never existed, and then drives those who have destroyed Him to construct a picture like this as the real genuine thing, must be mistaken? Is it not clear that the critics have failed just because the idea that Jesus was a man, either of our time or of His own time, Whose life and actions were to be accounted for in the same way as those of other men, is false, that if we are to arrive at the real Jesus, the Jesus Who lived long ago in Galilee, the Jesus Who lives now at the Right Hand of God, we must set out on the search, not by ruling out the supernatural, but by admitting it to the full, and seeking for a Jesus in Whom it is embodied and expressed? When we do that we will find painted in the Gospels, as Christian thinkers always have found, the portrait of One, perfect Man, but more than that, perfect God; One Who revealed the moral character of God, but Who revealed, too, His Power over the physical world; One Who came into the world in a way different from the ordinary course of nature, because His coming was a new thing in human history; Who rose again the third day because it was not possible that "He could be holden of death."[1]

[1] Acts ii. 24.

CHAPTER VI

THE REALITY OF MIRACLE

IN the last chapter we have tried to show that if we are to arrive at the real Jesus we must begin our investigation of the Gospels with the full recognition of the existence in Him of the Supernatural, and that, therefore, to take an example, the conviction that no man can feed a multitude with a few loaves and fishes, and that any such tale told of an ordinary man must be an invention, is entirely inapplicable when dealing with Him. Let us be quite clear that there is no half-way house, and then let us consider what it is that drives Professor Bethune-Baker and others to desperate efforts to try and find one. He holds—at least so he professes—the truth of the Incarnation. As expressed in the Quicunque Vult or a Christian hymn such as—

> "The God Whom earth and sea and sky
> Adore and laud and magnify,
> Whose might they own, Whose praise they swell,
> In Mary's womb vouchsafed to dwell," [1]

[1] Hymns A. & M. 449. This is J. M. Neale's translation of the old Latin hymn, "Quem terra, ponthus, æthera," which according to most medieval breviaries was sung on Festivals of the Virgin.

this is the most stupendous miracle conceivable—a miracle, in comparison with which the Virgin-Birth, or the emptying of the Tomb, are trifles; and to one who tries to appreciate the proportion of things, those who profess to accept the former while they reject the latter, seem to be straining at gnats while they swallow camels. What is the explanation? What is the relation of God to the Universe? What is the relation of matter to spirit? These are enormous questions. The whole religious attitude of man depends on the answers, and until we give our answers to them, it is impossible to hope that our consideration of miracles will lead to any satisfactory conclusion.

Two ideas have very largely prevailed. A false antithesis between matter and spirit has been maintained by many. Matter, instead of being regarded as the vehicle, the expression of spirit, has been looked on as rigidly opposed to it. S. Paul has been interpreted, when he talks of the struggle between the spirit and the flesh,[1] as describing a struggle between the material and the spiritual, instead of one between two spiritual forces struggling for mastery over the human soul. Further than that it has been held that matter is the seat of evil; is itself evil; and that man is to escape from evil by divesting himself of all contact with matter. There are few ideas that have played a greater part

[1] Gal. v. 17. Cf. the argument in Romans vii. and viii.

in human thought than this. In some of its many forms it is to be found almost everywhere, and although we may condemn it as totally opposed to the teaching of Christ we are always in danger of being unconsciously influenced by it.

At the present time, however, the other idea to which we refer is much more widespread. It is consciously and deliberately accepted by many, and it seems to be ground which really underlies Professor Bethune-Baker's thinking.

Science has made enormous progress. Since the time of Copernicus we have learnt that the earth is only a minute point in a vast physical universe ; we have learnt that physical law reigns triumphant everywhere ; that the same causes are always followed by the same effects ; in fact, that the Universe is a vast machine working out its way without reference to man, and that therefore any departure from the established order of things, such as the Virgin-Birth, or the emptying of the Tomb, are unthinkable. No one, of course, can fail to be impressed by ideas such as these. There are times when the thought of the immensity and wonder of the material Universe seems overwhelming, and blots out the vision of anything beyond itself. Then we begin to think. The Psalmist of old looked on the starry sky with the wonder and the beauty that it conveyed to him and rose to the grand thought, " The heavens declare the glory

of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork,"[1] and if that was true of the Universe as he knew it, how much more of the Universe as we know it to-day? The material world is not self-existent. It is the work of God; it comes from God; it expresses the Mind of God. We have learnt to see in all the wonderful progress and development of the world the way that God works out His purpose. It is a grand conception. It gives the sure foundation of all scientific investigation, and the assurance that that investigation will not end in smoke. Man assumes that the Universe is rational; that he can, to some extent—to an ever-increasing extent—understand it, but what ground is there for believing this except the faith that the Universe is the work of the eternal Mind and the expression of it? Again, man assumes everywhere the reign of law. Without this assumption all science would become impossible; but human observation, wonderful as the things it has discovered really are, is largely restricted in space to the minute spot which we call the earth, and to a period of time which is a mere moment compared with the ages that roll by. Observation restricted thus could never afford any rational basis for the belief in the reign of law. It is only when we grasp that the Universe is the expression of the Mind of God and that "our God is not a god

[1] Ps. xix. 1.

of confusion but of peace,"[1] that we gain a solid ground of confidence and can go on knowing that we are not being deluded by appearances, but that these correspond to reality.

It seems unnecessary to stop to argue that this is the Christian view of the Universe ; it is written plainly on the pages of Scripture. We learn there, to use present-day language, that God is transcendent as well as immanent, that He is not only the Creator but the Preserver of the world, that in Him " we live and move and have our being,"[2] while at the same time " the Lord sitteth above the waterflood : the Lord remaineth a King for ever."[3]

It is contradicted, of course, by the cold Deism which compared God to the watchmaker and the Universe to the watch ; it is contradicted by Pantheism which identifies God and the Universe ; it is quite inconsistent with Professor Bethune-Baker's view of God as a constitutional Monarch—One Who gave the Universe a constitution without grasping the difficulties that the constitution would ultimately put in His way, and Who is totally debarred by it from producing such a phenomenon as the Virgin-Birth ;[4] but it opens a vision of glory

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 33. [2] Acts xvii. 28. [3] Ps. xxix. 9 (P.B.V.).

[4] Op. cit., p. 145 ff. The question of a finite God—and Professor Bethune-Baker's God seems to be very finite—has been much discussed of late. Those who wish to pursue the subject further cannot do better than read the series of Gifford Lectures on " God and Personality," recently published by Mr. Clement C. J. Webb. The subject is specially dealt with in

before which the heart of man can fall down and worship. The Universe comes from God, ends in God. The stately drama of history rolling on age after age reveals His Mind. The centre of that history is the Incarnation ; an event prepared for by all that went before ; an event from which all that follows after flows. The drama has a beginning and an end. History—in the sense that the world can ever go back to the condition of things that existed in days gone by and has passed away—can never repeat itself. We do not look for another Virgin-Birth simply because the circumstances, physical, moral, spiritual, from which it flowed, can never recur. There never can be another feeding of the multitude with a few loaves and fishes, because the Eternal Son can never again be on earth in human form revealing the Power and the Love of God to men ; but in the light of that vision, it is seen to be as natural that He should do so, as it is impossible to conceive it wrought by anyone else.

The reality of miracle flows from the reality of God. God works through the ordinary course of nature. He reveals Himself there day by day, but

Lecture VI. We entirely endorse the judgment given there on pp. 137–8 : " I feel convinced that when once a stage of intellectual development has been reached at which the question of the relation of God to the Absolute would arise, no conception of God which takes Him for less than the ultimate Reality will satisfy the demands of the religious consciousness."

man could never grasp that fact if He had never revealed Himself in startling ways, what we call miracle. No miracle, no God, at any rate no God Who is in any real sense transcendent, is a truth that has always commended itself to the religious consciousness and will go on doing so so long as that consciousness remains alive.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

WE are not going to attempt anything of a detailed criticism of Professor Bethune-Baker's exposition of the Religious Value of the various articles of the Creed. Anyone who knows anything of what the Christian Religion really is will surely be struck, on the one hand, with the inadequacy of the exposition, and on the other with the confusion of thought that seems to pervade it. One illustration, taken from the paragraphs on the Forgiveness of Sins, will, we think, sufficiently illustrate this. Forgiveness of sins, we are told, is the aim of all religions. "It is the Christian's conception of God, and man's relation to Him, that gives a special character to the forgiveness of sins in which we profess our belief."[1] So then, the difference between Christianity and other religions is not that the former brings forgiveness within the reach of every struggling soul while the others only strive to attain it, but only in the different idea they form of what it is! But further, with regard to sin itself, we are told, "It is the whole

[1] p. 167.

personality that is at stake, and sin, according to the truly Christian conception of it, is something—anything—that mars personality and prevents or impedes its development in life to the end for which, in Creation, God destined it. . . . A Christian man's whole religious duty is to realise as vividly as he can the purpose of God, and to co-operate with Him, as fully and as consciously as he can." [1] This is quite good, but instead of going on, as we should expect, to expound how the ordinary man is to "realise" the purpose of God, and to "co-operate with Him," both of which are, for ignorant people—and, we believe, for learned ones too—exceedingly difficult things, he continues, "It is one of the strangest paradoxes in the history of Christianity, that the words 'religious duties' should have the sense they usually bear, and that the observance of rites and ceremonies, and days and seasons, and the acceptance of formulas, all of which are of man's making as a means to the end, should be regarded as the criterion of a man's status before God." So, then, Holy Baptism, the Holy Eucharist, joining in Common Prayer, listening to the teaching of the Church, and accepting the Faith taught in the Gospels, are all trifles! They can be belittled and neglected without sin, and the Bishop of Ely is accused of taking a perverted view of them because he maintains, that when men repeat the Creed, they ought

[1] pp. 167–8.

to mean what they say! After that, it is little wonder to find the Professor regarding it as a mark of the healthy-minded man that the last thing he troubles about is his sins![1] But we are astonished to read on p. 191 that "liberal Christians usually value the institutions of their Church as highly, and observe them as fully, as the orthodox." It is tempting to go on, but we must content ourselves with a few remarks on subjects dealt with in the chapter on "Readjustment" at the end of the Professor's book.

The first of these is one that has come before us a good deal already; it is the question of the reality of miracles. The Professor rightly grasps that this is the real centre of the whole matter, that if a man denies the possibility of miracle he cannot accept historic Christianity, but must discover some kind of "interpretation" which will enable him to retain the profession while he denies the reality. What is the way out? Speaking of a "Christian student" the Professor tells us, "Convinced as he may be with regard to the central Figure of the whole story, that He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, he cannot distinguish nearly so sharply as Christian apologists have distinguished in the past, between the records of miracles in the Gospels and elsewhere. He sees that religious thought of all ages has always ex-

[1] p. 169.

pressed its belief in Divine action and activity in terms of the miraculous: No miracle, no God. And the question presents itself to him whether the 'miraculous' is not simply the religious way of approaching and interpreting happenings which accompany what is believed to be a Divine Manifestation; whether this mode of interpretation is not essentially 'rationalistic' and entirely conditioned by the scientific' presuppositions, or the 'psychology' of the percipient."[1]

We do not profess to be able to adequately interpret this last sentence, and we are not convinced that the "religious thought of all ages," the belief expressed in the words, "No miracle, no God," is necessarily mistaken; but what we would remark is, that these nice-sounding generalities, before they are accepted, should be tested by their application to particular cases, and the wise man will hesitate about accepting them till he has to some extent carried out this testing. Will the Professor's view, which apparently is that ordinary events become miracles when they are interpreted religiously or spiritually, stand this test?

We have referred before to the difficulty presented by the feeding of the five thousand, and we have quoted the interpretation of it given by Schweitzer and accepted by Dr. Sanday. Professor Bethune-Baker does not tell us whether he agrees on this

[1] p. 181.

point with his Oxford brother, or whether he has some other way of getting rid of this very inconvenient story, but in the absence of the latter we may assume that the former holds the field. How then does it work out? What was, in reality, a sacramental meal, when every one was in such a state of spiritual exaltation that the common needs of this life were completely overlooked, and the multitude thought they had had a solid meal, when, as a matter of fact, they had had nothing—this sacramental meal, when *interpreted religiously or spiritually*, becomes the solid repast we are told of in the Gospels. Let him believe it who can! Most people would think that it would be much more honest to say straight out that the Gospel stories are held to be lies,[1] and that of Jesus

[1] This is the method adopted by Dr. Wendland. In a note on p. 180 Professor Bethune-Baker speaks of his book on *Christianity and Miracles* as "far and away the best book on the subject." His standpoint is summed up in the phrase, "To believe in the living God and to believe in miracle are the same thing. It is inconsistent to accept the first and deny the second" (p. 1). In adopting this position he agrees entirely with recent English writers such as Dr. Strong, Professor Headlam, and the late Dr. Illingworth, but unlike them he rejects the Feeding of the Five Thousand and other nature miracles, the group which Dr. Sanday describes as "contra-naturam." His reason for doing this is illuminating. "In themselves," he writes, on page 227, "of course, even miracles of this kind are possible for Divine omnipotence. But the rest of our religious and historical experience shows that it is not in this way that God is wont to deal with us. Hence it must remain doubtful whether God has ever wrought events of such a kind in the course of redeeming history." The argument of course is good if the Incarnation is

and His doings we have really no trustworthy information.

But what about the future? "I do not believe," the Professor writes, "that the masses of the people will ever in the future be held by a Religion which in any way disparages the intellect of man as a means of arriving at the truth of things, and one of the chief channels through which the Spirit of God works in the world and reveals the purpose of life."[1] With this we heartily agree. A religion that abides must satisfy the reason of man, but it must satisfy his religious consciousness as well; it must provide him with an object of worship before which he can lose himself in lowest adoration; it

a myth, and as a matter of fact, Wendland clearly does not believe it. Throughout his book he never explicitly mentions it, and on page 231 he writes, "That God has spoken through Christ as through the prophets; that by this Divine revelation a certain stream of history was initiated, and in the course of this history Divine effects—mediated in miraculous modes and by deeds of power—have been caused in the world both of spirit and of sense, and have met with real understanding: all this remains true." On this showing of course the nature miracles are out of harmony with the life of Christ because they reveal Him as One, not only inspired like the prophets, but as possessing that Divine omnipotence to which such miracles are possible and which those miracles were intended to reveal to the world. They are beams of light breaking through the clouds from time to time and revealing Him as what He truly was—God manifest in the flesh. That is the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, and it is just because the writers referred to above differ from Wendland in accepting it that they accept the nature miracles, and it is apparently for this reason that they are described by Professor Bethune-Baker as "mischievously apologetic."

[1] p. 195.

must picture a God Who is at once infinitely above man, One " Whose ways are not as our ways, Whose thoughts are not as our thoughts " ; One, therefore, Whom the mind of man cannot comprehend, though it may come to know Him bit by bit, as He reveals Himself to the longing soul. In other words religion is essentially mysterious, just because it deals with life in its fulness ; with the things of the spirit as well as those which appeal to the senses ; with the things of eternity as well as those of time. These are truths which the human intellect, unless it is of that utterly shallow order that thinks that the mind of man is the measure of all things, grasps as obvious, and the human intellect will therefore condemn at once a religion which professes to get rid, or to make little, of the element of mystery. In this life, " we see through a glass darkly—we know in part—we walk by faith not by sight."[1] That is the teaching of the Apostle ; it is the teaching of reason, too. The mind of man cannot fathom the deep things of God. It must be content with sufficient light to walk by here and now—light that gives good hope that in the course of time the shadows will flee away, and we shall come to " know even as also we are known." To ask for more is utterly irrational.[2]

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12 ; 2 Cor. v. 7.

[2] We might have left this matter here, but we cannot avoid a protest against the criticism which Professor Bethune-Baker passes on one of the greatest Christians of the last century, one

But again we are told, and this seems to be the conclusion of the whole matter, "When it (i.e. the democracy) gains a truer historical perspective, it may learn to respect the old orthodoxy, as liberal Christians respect it; but it was while the old orthodoxy reigned that the multitude of all classes was lost to the Church, and it is probable that only the new interpretation of the old beliefs can win them to Christ and preserve the Faith of a Christian as the religion of the new era, the dawn of which is already flushing the future with hope."[1]

who had a really great influence with the toiling masses of the Diocese of Durham. "Some sixty years ago," he writes, on page 182, "Dr. Westcott summoned us to cease to base belief in the Christian Revelation on the evidence of the Miracles by which it was, as he believed, attended, and rather to regard them as parts of the Revelation itself. But he never made clear what it was that they revealed as to the ways in which God actually works in the world, or as to the actual conditions, spiritual, moral, or physical, under which, as long as we are in the world, we must live, so that we should be justified in relying on God to succour us in our need in similar ways." It is to the concluding words we would direct attention. They assume that the mind of man is capable, not only of devoutly studying the works of God, and from that study of learning something of God's nature and character, but that it can so fully grasp the laws of His working as to be able to predict the ways He would act under certain circumstances! Bishop Westcott was much too deep a thinker to imagine that he could do anything of the sort. Such a notion could surely only arise in what is really a very shallow mind.

[1] p. 196. Those who have read the *New Theology* will remember how Mr. Campbell explained the total failure of the Churches in our day to hold the masses of ordinary people and the powerlessness of orthodoxy to satisfy their religious feelings and proceeded to expound the teaching which he believed could do this and make the nation once more Christian. *The New*

Yes, but it has been during the time since "liberal Christianity" began to spread in the last century that the multitudes have been lost, and it was orthodox Christianity that gained them and held them for centuries. They were gained and held by a religion that put the supernatural in its right place; that claimed to have a message from the unseen world beyond, and to be a real power for determining the eternal destiny of man. The weakness has come when these things were allowed to sink into the second place and religion was looked on as mainly concerned with the improvement of social conditions in this world. We are told of a great hope. We know that we are saved by hope. We trust there are some signs of it—that the Church is going to waken to the greatness of her call and her opportunity; we trust that the blessing of God will rest upon her, and that real religion will attain a dominion over the hearts of men such as it has never had before; but let us be quite sure that it is only a Christ Who really works wonders; a Christ, to Whom, when He lived on earth, it was quite natural to feed the multitudes with a few loaves and fishes; a Christ Who works wonders

Theology was published several years ago, and there are no very perceptible signs of its having accomplished much. The author himself has acknowledged the failure, returned to orthodoxy, and withdrawn the book from circulation. How long will it be before, by the Grace of God, the Lady Margaret Professor does the same?

now by subduing the hearts of men to the most complete self-denial in His service, Who will ever win any real victories and do anything to raise mankind nearer God. *That* Christ does win victories to-day. It was He Who inspired Father Damien for his life work amongst the lepers; it was He Who sent Bishops Patteson and Hannington to their deaths in Santa Cruce and Uganda; it is He Who before our own eyes has inspired numbers in Madagascar, China, and Central Africa, to die rather than deny Him; it is He Who inspires multitudes of men and women to-day to toil and work for the destruction of evil and the bettering of human life; it is He Who goes on conquering and to conquer in the Mission Field; for Whom the multitudes in India and elsewhere are clamouring; it is He Whom parish priests, unknown and unnoticed by the world, see working for the salvation of souls and the destruction of the kingdom of Satan. Can the "liberal Christ" show any such credentials? Has He any conquests to His credit? Is there the smallest evidence that He has done or does do anything to make men and women Christians who were not Christians before, to stir men to a sense of their sin and drive them in lowest penitence to seek a Saviour? Is it not true that the Lady Margaret Professor and other prophets of the "liberal Christ" were themselves once numbered amongst the orthodox, and having, for

some reason or other, lost their first faith, are trying to find something to cling to in the hope that it will prevent them sinking into the abyss of infidelity ?

At the present moment the Bishop of Chelmsford is starting a great Crusade to Christianise his diocese, to regain, if it may be, the multitudes of all classes in London-over-the-Border and elsewhere, who are alienated from all outward profession of religion ; if Professor Bethune-Baker, and others of his way of thinking, will abandon their comfortable posts and prove the power of their new gospel by throwing themselves into the work of this crusade, and with the power inspired by confident hope making it a triumphant success and establishing Christianity as a real power amongst us, no one will rejoice more sincerely, no one will thank them more deeply, than the Bishop and Clergy of this great and very difficult diocese ; but till we see some such tangible evidence of its power we may be pardoned if we think that the probability of the " new interpretation of the old beliefs " winning the masses to Christ and preserving the Faith of a Christian as a religion of the new era " is, to put it mildly, extraordinarily small, so small indeed, that it may be regarded as non-existent.

No ; it will take much deeper thought and much better arguments than any that we find in " *The*

Faith of the Apostles' Creed to persuade us to desert the Master in Whose service we have lived, Who has worked for the blessing of our own souls, Whom we have seen working in the souls of others, for a "liberal Christ" however simple and outwardly attractive He may appear; Who may, in the beauty of His human character, be an example that we would do well to imitate; but Who, just because He is natural, not supernatural; because He is man, not God, cannot be the object of our worship, and cannot be a real power to save the sin-laden soul.

Printed in Great Britain for Robert Scott, *Publisher*, Paternoster Row London, *by* W. Brendon and Son, Ltd., Plymouth.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BT
993
B45
A5

Allen, Andrew James Campbell.
The Christ of the future; a criti
a forecast. With a foreword by J.E
Ditchfield. London, R. Scott, 1920
77p. 20cm.

1. Bethune-Baker, James Franklin,
The faith of the apostles' creed.
CCSC

A022272